

**REMARKS**

The Amendment, filed in response to the Office Action mailed March 13, 2009, is believed to be fully responsive to all issues raised in the Office Action. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

**Claims Disposition and Summary of Claim Amendments**

Claims 1-13 were all the claims pending in the application and rejected in the Office Action. Claims 4-5 and 9-12 were indicated to be allowable, if rewritten to overcome 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Upon entry of the Amendment, which is respectfully requested, claims 1-3 and 8 will be canceled and claim 4 will be rewritten into an independent form containing all of the limitations of its base and intervening claims (i.e., claims 1-3).

Claims 6, 7, and 13 will be amended to correct claim dependency, in accordance with the cancellation of claims 1-3.

No new matter is introduced.

**Response to Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

In the Office Action, claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office states that the limitation "protrusion member" of claim 1, line 9 lacks an antecedent basis, and thus claim 1 and its dependent claims are indefinite.

In response, the term “the protrusion member” is amended to read “the protrusion part,” rendering the rejection moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Response to Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as assertedly being anticipated by Tucker *et al.* (US Patent 4,238,056).

Without acquiescing the rejection or commenting thereon, solely in order to compact the prosecution, claim 1 is canceled and claim 6 is amended to refer to claim 4, rendering the rejection moot. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Response to Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and Allowable Claims**

In the Office Action, claims 2, 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as assertedly being unpatentable over Tucker *et al.* (US Patent 4,238,056) in view of Aperlo (US Patent No. 3,738,543).

Without acquiescing the rejection or commenting thereon, solely in order to compact the prosecution, claims 2 and 3 are canceled and claim 4 is rewritten into an independent claim containing all of the limitations of claims 1-3, rendering the rejection moot. Claim 13 is amended to refer to claim 4. Thus, the currently presented claim 4 and claims 5-7 and 9-13, which each directly or indirectly refer to claim 4, are allowable.

In this regard, Applicant notes that the Office indicates claims 4-5 and 9-12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph discussed above, and respectfully submit that the currently presented claim 4 and its dependent claims are allowable.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number **202-775-7588**.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sunhee Lee/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 12, 2009

---

Sunhee Lee  
Registration No. 53,892